

Northeastern University



**School of Law
Library**

GREAT DECISIONS IN FOREIGN POLICY

RECEIVED

AUG 13 1975

N. U. LAW LIBRARY

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETY-FOURTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

1975 NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON GREAT DECISIONS IN
UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

APRIL 9, 1975



Y 4, F 76/2: P 75/4

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1975

53-005

NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY SCHOOL of LAW LIBRARY

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

JOHN SPARKMAN, Alabama, *Chairman*

MIKE MANSFIELD, Montana

FRANK CHURCH, Idaho

STUART SYMINGTON, Missouri

CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island

GALE W. MCGEE, Wyoming

GEORGE S. MCGOVERN, South Dakota

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Minnesota

DICK CLARK, Iowa

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr., Delaware

CLIFFORD P. CASE, New Jersey

JACOB K. JAVITS, New York

HUGH SCOTT, Pennsylvania

JAMES B. PEARSON, Kansas

CHARLES H. PERCY, Illinois

ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, Michigan

HOWARD H. BAKER, Jr., Tennessee

PAT M. HOLT, *Chief of Staff*

ARTHUR M. KUHL, *Chief Clerk*

(II)

0074460

CONTENTS

Statement of:

Anderson, Edna Barrie, World Affairs Council of Syracuse, Syracuse, N.Y.-----	Page 23
Baumann, Carol Edler, Institute of World Affairs, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Wis-----	17
Buck, Pitman S., Jr., Great Decisions Program, Galveston County, Texas City, Tex-----	19
Burgess, Carter L., chairman, Foreign Policy Association-----	1
Hooper, Alice P., Community College of Vermont-----	3
Metzger, Irwin, Rochester, N.Y., Association for the United Nations, Great Decisions Program-----	5
Rice, John T., United Nations Association of Morris-Somerset Counties, Mountain Lakes, N.J-----	9
Ruprecht, Antony Mark, Department of Political Science, Nebraska Wesleyan University, Lincoln, Nebr-----	10
Stephens, Howard G., University of Arkansas at Little Rock, Division of Continuing Education, Great Decisions Program-----	20

GREAT DECISIONS IN FOREIGN POLICY

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 9, 1975

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
Washington, D.C.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10 a.m., in room 4221, Dirksen Senate Office Building, the Hon. John Sparkman (chairman), presiding.

Present: Senators Sparkman, McGee, Clark, and Javits.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the committee come to order, please.

I was waiting a short time in the hope that some of the other Senators would come in. Some of them have indicated they will be here, but I think we had better get started without them.

OPENING STATEMENT

Today we have the 1975 National Conference on Great Decisions in United States Foreign Policy. Your group is meeting here, in Washington, I believe, and we are very glad to have the opportunity to hear your views. I remember quite well a similar meeting we had just a year ago. It was a very, very fine meeting, and I wish very much that the whole committee could be here.

Unfortunately, we have an everlasting conflict between committee meetings. I have a conflict myself. We are marking up a very important housing bill in the Banking Committee for which I need to be present, but I want to get this meeting underway and perhaps other members will be coming in. I certainly hope so.

The Chairman of the Foreign Policy Association (FPA) is Mr. Carter L. Burgess.

Mr. Burgess, we are very glad to have you here. Will you present your associates and proceed in your own way?

STATEMENT OF CARTER L. BURGESS, CHAIRMAN, FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION

Mr. BURGESS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Before you and the committee this morning are delegates to the 1975 FPA Conference on Great Decisions in United States Foreign Policy from over 40 States and Alaska which helps make this record attendance possible this year.

Each of us knows full well of the wide gravity of national and international matters that are before the Congress and this committee right now.

However, may we again thank you for your willingness to continue to offer opportunities for citizens at large to discuss world affairs issues and offer public opinions on them.

PUBLIC OPINION KEY TO FOREIGN POLICY EFFECTIVENESS

One of our experienced leaders wrote just recently that “* * * for better or worse, a foreign policy will not be effective over the long run if public opinion does not support it; and since public opinion cannot be expected to have an informed judgment on each specific decision taken day-by-day, its assent has to be to the general tendency and direction of the policy—to its guiding principles * * *”.

We can also find other statements from our national leaders (Thomas Jefferson and George Kennan) that fortify this belief as we consider the time ahead from this bicentennial range of expression.

FPA'S PURPOSE

FPA continues to help keep this belief alive as a national public service organization. This association, since 1918, has had as its sole purpose the provision of educational and informational materials and sponsorship of meetings designed to increase the interest and knowledge of the widest number of Americans in international affairs, which increasingly affect our daily lives and may determine our survival.

GREAT DECISIONS PROGRAM

FPA's Great Decisions program is offered to high schools, universities, community colleges and citizen discussion groups, and along with its TV, radio, and media support reaches out to more Americans than any other international educational service today.

Several of our delegates last evening asked me to state at this point that FPA issues the Great Decisions book in quantities of about 75,000. We figure that after these books are distributed throughout the country, the multiplier effect moves that figure up to about 150 or 175,000 participants in discussion groups throughout the country. When you fortify that with our media work we estimate that about 1 million or 1½ million Americans take a live interest in these eight topics over the course of the first part of the year.

You will be hearing this morning about ballots and a very large percentage of participants do send in the ballots printed in the Great Decisions book. Given that large number of ballots, we think we have one of the best public opinion expressions on foreign policy issues in the country today. This is certainly a much more sizeable number than you get in the regular public surveys run by the professional organization.

Our long experience shows that interest and understanding come best when the subjects are talked over; and FPA's materials are designed to provide for frequent discussion and involvement in hundreds of communities around the Nation.

Great Decisions participants are urged to add their own points of view to public opinion and take an interest in the world affairs knowledge and position of their political candidates.

This is why the Great Decisions delegates are here before you again this year.

CURTAILMENT OF INTERNATIONAL AND FOREIGN POLICY PROGRAMS

Over the immediate past 12 months, programs undertaken by FPA and other nongovernmental organizations which serve education and citizen interest in international affairs have been severely curtailed due to changing priorities and economic pressures on the individuals, corporations, and foundations which financially support such institutions.

From the looks of things, these curtailments will continue over the long range. Since international and foreign policy programs have never been top priorities of philanthropic giving, your committee might wish to consider this matter in due course.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT SUGGESTED

Science, medicine, culture and the humanities have earned from the Congress, national endowments to provide stable support, under appropriate auspices.

Today, foreign policy education and studies may well have earned and require a national endowment of modest size to bring them a more stable and continuing support.

FPA has recommended such action to the Commission on the Organization of the Government for the Conduct of Foreign Policy, and we hope it will receive study.

While trying to stay ahead of the sheriff, FPA will continue to work hard to maintain the main features of its voluntary program in the field of foreign policy education here at home.

HEARING PROCEDURE

Great Decisions is now in its 21st year and for today we suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we follow the format that your committee approved for last year's hearing.

Our delegates have selected eight spokespersons to cover five Great Decisions topics for 1975.

The first topic is "The World Food Problem," and Alice P. Hooper of the Community College of Vermont, Montpelier, Vt., and Irwin J. Metzger of the Rochester Association for the United Nations, Rochester, N.Y., will speak to this first Great Decisions.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well, thank you. Ms. Hooper, we are very glad to hear from you.

STATEMENT OF ALICE P. HOOPER, COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF VERMONT

Ms. HOOPER. Mr. Chairperson, I am Alice Hooper from Middlesex, Vt., representing the community college and the Vermont Council for World Affairs.

Prospects of bumper crops in 1975 should not allow us to evade the thorny moral and economic problems posed by food and the related problems of population, distribution, internal development, and wealth. Great Decisions participants were challenged by the awesome array of problems and possible solutions. I shall present the recommendations of our Great Decisions groups which were addressed on the opinion ballots.

CREATION OF WORLD FOOD RESERVE SYSTEM

The recommendation receiving the largest support from the tens of thousands of participants in 43 States urged creation of a world food reserve system managed by an international authority and called on the United States to give serious consideration to participation in such a system. The logistical questions of how this reserve system should be monitored, who should contribute to and partake of the food were not spelled out in the participants' responses. However, international control was preferred to an international system with nations managing the reserves themselves. In their balloting, Great Decisions participants have concluded that the food problem is global and must be addressed on an international level.

HEARING PROCEDURE

The CHAIRMAN. May I interrupt just a minute.

As I said a few minutes ago, I have to go upstairs to the markup of the housing bill. Senator Clark has very kindly agreed to preside.

I just want to say this word to Senator Clark. I am sure you are not familiar with this annual discussion, but its on Great Decisions.

Senator CLARK. Right.

The CHAIRMAN. We had a very fine discussion last year, and they are here this year discussing the many different problems that confront the world. I am sure you will find it most rewarding listening, and this is a very fine publication.

Mr. Burgess mentioned "staying ahead of the sheriff." It looks to me like you are doing pretty well.

Mr BURGESS. We are just ahead of the sheriff.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well. I don't like to leave you, but we do run into conflicts when we are marking up a bill. If all of you will excuse me, I turn it over to Senator Clark. Thank you. Eleven committee members, by the way, are supposed to be here today.

Thank you very much.

Senator CLARK. [presiding]. You are talking about world food?

Ms. HOOPER. Yes, sir.

Senator CLARK. That is good. That is one of my major interests, too. You proceed in the way in which you have already started and then perhaps we will have some questions.

ESTABLISHMENT OF INTERNAL U.S. FOOD RESERVE

Ms. HOOPER. Participation in the international food reserve system does not preclude the establishment of an internal U.S. reserve which might be necessary not only to assist hungry Americans but also to respond to other national or international crises. After broad and considerable debate, there is no clear consensus as to whether food should be used as a foreign policy weapon. Americans are divided as to whether food is a commodity or a human right, but this philosophical discussion should not bog us down when we are called to respond to an urgent need.

U.S. FREE MARKET POLICIES AND PUBLIC LAW 480 AID

On an overall basis, the Great Decisions participants broadly support U.S. policies of reliance on the free market to stimulate domestic food production and of increased food aid under Public Law 480. Although the exact increase of food aid was not specified, there was strong support for a moderate increase whereas a sharp increase was favored by few.

Senator CLARK. Would that be a sharp increase in the levels of Public Law 480?

Ms. HOOPER. Yes, sir.

Senator CLARK. There was no strong feeling in this direction?

Ms. HOOPER. Not for a sharp increase but for a moderate increase.

NOTION OF LOWER INDIVIDUAL CONSUMPTION

There seems to be strong support for the notion that individual Americans can contribute to the world supply in a voluntary, not mandatory, way by disciplining themselves in their meat consumption and fertilizer use. It was acknowledged that action beyond simple self-denial of a hamburger and a green lawn is required to insure that food and fertilizer reach the hands of the needy. Willingness to lower consumption does indicate broad individual concern for participating in a solution of a global problem.

IDEA OF FOOD-MATCHING PROGRAM

There were a number of suggestions which arose in our discussions quite apart from the specific points which we were asked to consider. An idea received from North Carolina was particularly intriguing. They suggested that a food-matching program would provide incentives for developing countries to increase their food production. Each crop increase would be matched by increased food aid. In the second part of this report Mr. Metzger will indicate some of these individual suggestions and concerns which received broad discussion and recommendation.

Senator CLARK. Fine.

Mr. Metzger.

STATEMENT OF IRWIN METZGER, ROCHESTER, N.Y., ASSOCIATION
FOR THE UNITED NATIONS, GREAT DECISIONS PROGRAM

Mr. METZGER. Mr. Chairman, my name is Irwin Metzger, and I am a representative of the Rochester Association for the United Nations, which is the sponsoring group of the Great Decisions program in Rochester. Let me state at the outset of my presentation that no subject evoked the depth of feeling or the breadth of additional suggestions from the great decisions participants as that of world food. From these comments and concerns I have summarized those which were voiced repeatedly and which need to be addressed.

TECHNICAL AND EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE CONCERNING FOOD

Foremost among the concerns of the participants is our recommendation to you that a healthy U.S. foreign food aid policy to needy nations be accompanied by technological assistance and educational assistance consistently applied in a nonpaternalistic way. Our long-range goal of helping lesser developed countries to self-sufficiency in agriculture must underscore our actions. Our concerns are summarized in a recent quote of Julius Nyerere of Tanzania, "If you give a man a fish, he eats for a day, if you teach him to fish, he eats for a lifetime." We feel the Peace Corps has been a useful vehicle for this technical and educational assistance. We note the creation of overseas local agricultural research stations with tool libraries, and we note the development of food storage facilities to increase the locally grown food supply as worthy areas of U.S. participation. We are sensitive to the fact that problems of irrigation, religious restriction, deforestation, overgrazing, inadequate water, to mention a few, vary from country to country, and we require that those who give assistance acquire the same sensitivity.

RESTRICTIONS ON LONG-RANGE FOOD AID

Accompanying our technical assistance, we feel that, for lack of a better word, strings must be attached to long-range food aid—as contrasted with emergency aid. Our groups are well aware that this is a touchy area, nevertheless we would encourage lesser developed countries to develop land reform programs, population information and control programs, and improved food distribution systems. We would like to feel that our support is reaching grassroot levels and that there is reliable feedback as to a given program's effectiveness. We recommend these restrictions in the knowledge that over the years many programs that were positive on the drawing board never came to fruition because of corruption or inefficiency in the recipient country.

CONCERNS IN DOMESTIC AREA

In the domestic area, a number of groups reported concerns. A significant minority of the great decisions participants felt that hungry Americans must be fed before aid is sent overseas, certainly a point which you may have noted through your constituents, but without which my report is incomplete.

American farm prices received mention; certain groups voiced concern regarding a drop in farm income that might accompany the distribution of food from a world reserve. Other groups felt that the American farm system was strong enough to absorb any swings. There is no clear consensus here, but the discussion emphasizes the level of the discussants' concerns.

SUGGESTIONS FOR MONITORING CROPS, CURBING WASTE, NUTRITIONAL EDUCATION

Briefly, additional and random suggestions that received consideration are as follows:

1. U.S. support for the Rome Food Conference recommendation for the creation of an early warning system to help monitor crop conditions, supplies or failures.

2. Launching of a vigorous campaign to curb waste in U.S. food habits.

3. A concerted effort, both within and outside the United States, to help educate undernourished people in better nutritional habits.

Mr. Chairman, as you can tell, if our participants are representative of the feeling within the United States, Americans as a whole are concerned over the problems of the needy at home, the malnourished abroad, the livelihood of the American farmer, and the sharing of our food resources. Those are admirable concerns and we are proud to transmit them to you.

INTEREST IN PROBLEM OF WORLD FOOD

Senator CLARK. I appreciate your comments. I think no issue in the last several years has stirred more interest than of world food. Certainly the Rome Conference had a great deal to do with that.

It's interesting that churches and universities have been extremely effective at creating interest across the country in that issue, more than with any issue I can remember in recent times.

SOLVING FAMINE AND MALNUTRITION PROBLEMS

One way to look at it is that you are really talking about two problems. One is the short-term problem of dealing with famine, where you try to get food to people when they need it very desperately. This year we had one of the greatest famines since the Second World War, and on the whole, we have been rather successful in meeting that crisis. Australia has doubled her commitment, Canada doubled hers, and we increased our commitment somewhat.

We are at a point where the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization reports that the total food shortage is down to approximately a million and a half tons, when, at the time we were in Rome it was about 7½ million tons. But I think you are right in saying that this is a short-term problem, and the long-term problem of malnutrition, where 400 million people are suffering from malnutrition, has to be solved by development.

The long-term solution is development, and not simply more food aid. That is just a kind of Bandaid solution to a short-term problem.

U.S. LEVELS AND USES OF FOOD AID

It is interesting that the levels of our food aid have significantly declined over the years. I know Secretary Butz is fond of saying we have been the great leader in the world with food aid in the past, and he is absolutely right—it is a thing of the past. Nine years ago the level of our food aid was 18 million tons. This year it is 5½ million tons. We are giving less than one-third the volume of food aid we gave less than a decade ago. I think just as important as the level of food aid is the way in which it is used.

Last year over half of all of the food assistance that we sent out of this country went to Indochina under title I, to be sold on the market and converted for military purposes. I think the areas you have discussed in your programs are the right areas. The question of the political uses of food to achieve foreign policy objectives is interesting.

I noted that in the middle of the Rome Food Conference in November, the Secretary of Agriculture left for the Middle East to make arrangements with Egypt and Syria for additional levels of loan under title I, not because Egypt is a major famine country this year, but because the Secretary of State saw an opportunity to use food as a foreign policy tool. We are not using it to feed hungry people, in spite of the fact that the United Nations listed 32 nations this year as famine-stricken nations. The last thing I want to mention is an amendment passed by Congress last year which restricted the political use of food. This amendment simply said that 70 percent of our food aid has to go to those 32 nations listed as most seriously affected by the famine.

I am delighted you took that kind of interest in the Great Decisions program and that you are discussing this issue, and we hope you will continue to discuss it.

EFFECTIVENESS OF CUTTING DOWN FOOD CONSUMPTION

I have one question about your statement that each of us should sacrifice a hamburger. Which of you talked about that?

Ms. HOOPER. I did.

Senator CLARK. I have a question about its effectiveness. I was interested in the fact your people felt that it would have some effect.

Could you summarize what they had hoped to do there.

Ms. HOOPER. It wasn't totally clear from the opinion ballots. Some of the comments indicated that failing to eat one hamburger was not an adequate solution. If you cut your own food consumption, an appropriate accompanying action is necessary. Perhaps the money saved from eating soybeans instead of hamburger could be sent to an international organization.

PROBLEM OF MALDISTRIBUTION

Senator CLARK. I am glad I asked because I think that is the right approach. Whether or not we ought to deny ourselves food is one question. I know I wish I could do a better job of that. Most Americans would be better off if they did. However, I don't think that helps the international food situation unless you convert that to money. CROP or CARE or the various voluntary agencies require money to buy food to send to hungry nations. I think that has to be the solution.

Basically the problem in the world, is not usually one of shortage of commodities. Historically the problem of malnutrition has not been an inadequate amount of supply of grain as it is now. In fact, throughout our history, we have been paying a million dollars a day to store grain. We didn't know what to do with it—we even were putting it on battleships while people were suffering from malnutrition. The problem has been not so much shortage but maldistribution. The people who are hungry simply don't have enough money to buy food when we have it.

Ms. HOOPER. I think that that was generally acknowledged by the groups and there was a great deal of concern for distribution and how that might better be accomplished.

Senator CLARK. Thank you very much; you did a good job.

Mr. METZGER. Thank you.

Senator CLARK. According to my schedule we are going to hear about the Soviet Union from John Rice and Antony Ruprecht.

Mr. BURGESS. That is correct, they are here and if you will come forward.

Senator CLARK. Mr. Rice, United Nations Association of Morris-Somerset Counties, Mountain Lakes, N.J., and Antony Ruprecht, Department of Political Science, Nebraska Wesleyan University in Lincoln.

Please proceed in any way you think appropriate.

STATEMENT OF JOHN T. RICE, UNITED NATIONS ASSOCIATION OF MORRIS-SOMERSET COUNTIES, MOUNTAIN LAKES, N.J.

Mr. RICE. Mr. Chairman, my name is John T. Rice, and I have been sponsoring discussions of the Great Decisions program of the Foreign Policy Association for a number of years in Morris, Somerset, and Essex Counties of New Jersey. But in my remarks today on the subject of "The Soviet Union Today," I am not necessarily expressing my personal opinions. I am reflecting the views of some 80 delegates representing 43 States and 59 communities who are now attending the 1975 National Conference on Great Decisions. I might state, as has been pointed out, that this program has an estimated 150,000 participants in the United States.

FAVORED U.S.-SOVIET POLICIES

As you have already been made aware, the Foreign Policy Association prepares each year a text of about 12 pages providing background information on each of 8 topics and at the end poses questions which the participants are asked to answer. Instead of trying to get a consensus, we tabulate each participant's answers and other suggestions, and we present them to you today as a summary of the views expressed.

A substantial majority of these great decisions participants voted in favor of continuing current U.S. policies of:

- (1) Seeking détente based on periodic summit conferences;
- (2) Negotiation of a nuclear arms agreement;
- (3) Increased economic, cultural and other exchanges; and
- (4) The U.S. policy of Government-backed trade credits—although some of the participants voted against this particular policy.

We realize that détente means different things to different people. But it was defined in the text the participants used as currently meaning "the term used to describe U.S.-Soviet efforts to improve relations and relax tensions."

A majority of these Great Decisions participants also favored proceeding cautiously with expansion of trade and granting of credits until Moscow convincingly demonstrates its desire for comprehensive and genuine détente. My colleague, Professor Ruprecht, who follows me in this presentation will develop this point further.

POLICIES MINORITY THOUGHT WE SHOULD ABANDON

A small minority of participants thought we should abandon our policy of détente unless Moscow liberalizes its internal regime and moves toward a more open system.

An even smaller minority of the participants thought we should abandon the pursuit of détente and build up U.S. military strength.

INDIVIDUAL SUGGESTIONS

A minority responded to a request for individual suggestions or comments. Some of these were that we should work more through the United Nations; that we should keep our talk exchanges going but have more exchanges at mid-Government level; and that we should be doing more teaching of the Russian history, character, and language. I had the privilege of traveling through the Soviet Union a couple of years ago starting out in Siberia only 60 miles from the Chinese border and then traveling through Siberia, Central Asia, the Black Sea area and then up through Moscow, Leningrad and on to Anchorage, Alaska, flying over the North Pole. I was very impressed and surprised at all of the linguistic institutes in so many areas of the vast Soviet Union territory where, I was told, large numbers of students were encouraged—maybe required is a better word—to study English. I submit that this may very well give their people a distinct advantage over us in the future since so few of our students are studying Russian.

Thank you for your attention and for the opportunity to appear before you today.

Senator CLARK. Thank you very much.

Professor.

STATEMENT OF ANTONY MARK RUPRECHT, DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE, NEBRASKA WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY, LINCOLN, NEBR.

Mr. RUPRECHT. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, my name is Antony Mark Ruprecht, and I am professor of political science at Nebraska Wesleyan University.

Dr. Rice has reported on the broad pattern of opinions regarding United States-Soviet détente. My remarks will mainly supplement his report by filling in with some of the interesting nuances, and qualifications vis-a-vis our détente policies.

MAJORITY VIEW CONCERNING PRESENT DÉTENTE POLICY

The majority of Great Decisions participants are for the present policy of détente. They recognize that we live in an interdependent world, or global village where conflagration or serious shortages in one part of the globe affect the whole; that a continuous and competitive nuclear arms race is costly and adds little to a nation's sense of security; that the possibility of a nuclear war, either by accident or design exists and can only end in catastrophe for all; that increased economic and cultural exchanges are highly beneficial.

RESERVATIONS CONCERNING ADMINISTRATION'S DÉTENTE POLICY

However, almost as many participants indicate some reservation toward the administration's policy of détente. They urge "proceed with caution," especially with reference to expansion of trade and granting of credits until Moscow convincingly demonstrates its desire

for genuine détente. A great number of participants share a feeling of distrust toward Soviet intentions which can be attributed to a variety of reasons:

(1) The declared statements of official Soviet propaganda based on Marxist-Leninist ideology; namely, that the U.S.S.R. will inevitably triumph in the struggle against capitalism.

(2) The Soviets' encouragement of what to us seems subversive activities in some developing countries; that is, South Vietnam, Cambodia, and perhaps Cuba.

(3) The Soviets' brutal interference in other nations' internal affairs; that is, Hungary, 1956; Czechoslovakia, 1968; and,

(4) Their perceived shrewdness in commercial transactions; that is, the wheat deal.

These themes of distrust are also reflected in the idea that détente might be considered only a temporary expedient by the U.S.S.R.

MORE CAUTIOUS APPROACH TO DÉTENTE

Summarizing the comments of our participants on this question, we can arrive at a fundamental position; namely, that the "full steam ahead" policy of détente should be mitigated by a more cautious approach that would insure that our resources would not be used to strengthen Soviet military capabilities.

Many participants believe that the United States is granting too many concessions especially in respect to trade. Consequently, a tougher stance is advocated that pays special attention to a quid pro quo or reciprocal arrangement—as one person put it "the trade agreement should be placed on a cash-and-carry basis."

TRADE BILL'S MOST FAVORED-NATION APPROACH

Senator CLARK. Did you interpret that to mean that your groups would not favor the trade bill that was passed? If we forget the aspect of the Jackson amendment for the moment—they would not favor a most-favored-nation approach?

Mr. RUPRECHT. No; I am saying that from the responses we have received the majority of the people are for the present approach; however, there is a feeling that we are giving away too much on a unilateral basis and that the full-steam-ahead policy should be mitigated by caution. Proceed with caution comes through all the time and, of course, this is coupled with the understanding that the majority of people don't quite trust the Soviet Union.

Senator CLARK. It doesn't necessarily mean that they wouldn't favor the most-favored-nation approach such as we passed in the trade bill. You mentioned something about the Soviets paying cash for everything they buy. Does that mean no credit terms?

Mr. RUPRECHT. Yes; the tougher stance is advocated. We should proceed with caution, and pay special attention to quid pro quo or reciprocal arrangements on a one-to-one basis, on an issue-to-issue basis. As one person put it, the trade agreement should be placed on a cash-and-carry basis and I interpret that to mean you give us one thing, we will give you another.

Senator CLARK. Right.

Senator MCGEE. Would you yield on that?

Senator CLARK. Yes.

QUID PRO QUO TRADE ARRANGEMENT

Senator McGEE. That is not a very sophisticated formula for developing trade relations; is it? I mean you are a very sophisticated person in this business. Would not a quid pro quo, a cash operation, be a very restrictive trade arrangement?

Mr. RUPRECHT. I would think so. The feeling of the responses would, however, indicate that we can't shake the feeling here that we are being taken advantage of, and I think a lot of people believe that the wheat deal for one was a major example. Whether that is justified or not I would contend this is the perception of a lot of people.

Senator McGEE. In other words, you use that description to reflect an attitude rather than recommend it specifically as an organizational format?

Mr. RUPRECHT. That is correct.

Senator McGEE. That places it in a little different context that I thought was suggested by your statement.

The reason I make the point is, without any question, the wheat deal was either a real finagling operation or a major boo boo. That puts it as gracefully as we can, but everyone learns that sometimes there are too many secretaries of State. We have a lot of them on the floor of the Senate, too.

It is a tough problem when a free society is dealing with a monolithic government to try to keep everything on track. I am trying to be tolerant toward things getting out of hand once in while, but I do think we have to be sure that there is enough latitude to make the quid pro quo realistic. I think we ought to be tough bargainers and not run around trying to help some private group we may feel indebted to; specifically, where you came from before entering government.

It is important that we not tie the hands of the negotiators and leave them as much flexibility as possible because we often gain a great deal with that, as you well know.

I appreciate the opportunity to clarify your viewpoint on this, because we rely on you as one of the most sophisticated groups in this country.

COMMENDATION OF GREAT DECISIONS PROGRAM

We have been involved in the Great Decisions program since its inception, and it is important that it succeed. My only criticism is that you don't have the whole country involved yet. We need that kind of help. Everyone thinks he knows more than the Secretary of State and becomes involved, but there still has to be that point at which to repose responsibility for the final negotiation.

Mr. RUPRECHT. If I might put this into context. I am not sure whether you received all of the foregoing content. The vast majority of Great Decisions participants are for the policy of détente. However, there is an indication that we should proceed with caution and, as you indicate, we should be tougher in our bargaining abilities and our bargaining posture.

Senator McGEE. I read the full statement and knew the context in which this was presented. What concerns me is that a negative or a hesitant attitude usually produces the next headline.

It is not very exciting to say that we think things are going pretty well in détente and ought to keep trying it. When you say we don't trust the Russians and we have to get tough, that will appear on all the news shows. We, therefore, tend to get things out of proportion, not because of the news media but because most of us, if the news said that things were going fairly well today and, "don't get excited folks, we are going to make it," wouldn't buy a paper or tune in the news shows. Something has to go wrong or you have to suspect something is going wrong before your ears perk up. I guess that is human nature. We have to learn to live with that.

One of the great purposes your group has always served is that the people in the Great Decisions programs have generally been willing to make allowances for human nature. They see that decisions regarding nations are often made on the basis of their extremists. That is, we judge Russians by a Russian who does something we don't like or something we think is foolish. They judge us perhaps by something some irresponsible Senator says. There are not very many irresponsible Senators. You are looking at three of the most responsible ones here. [Laughter.]

But this is the way judgments are made and trying to keep this in balance is a constant problem.

I want to commend you for your great effort and say that I am dizzy running a one-man show downstairs trying to protect the farm interests of Iowa. I have asked them to recess so I could get up here because of my respect for the efforts of your group, the Great Decisions program. We didn't do much for New York State yet in agriculture, but we did take care of Iowa this morning.

Senator JAVITS. Better hurry back.

Mr. BURGESS. If not improper may I thank Senator McGee for those strong good words for FPA and I hope they were heard around the Nation.

SOVIET CASH PAYMENT IN WHEAT DEAL

Senator CLARK. It is interesting that you call for cash in return for product. One problem with that example is that in the wheat sale, the Soviet Union did pay cash—we didn't give them any credit. In fact they came in and made separate contracts with each of the major grain companies unbeknownst to the other, and they did in fact pay cash for the deal. But continue.

TRADE CONCESSIONS AS LEVERAGE FOR INTERNAL CHANGE

Mr. RUPRECHT. Finally, we had asked our participants whether it would be acceptable to use trade concessions to the U.S.S.R. as a means of leverage to bring about liberalizing internal changes in the Soviet system. This had the support of only a minority. The majority were against that position presumably because the United States would not tolerate Soviet efforts to pressure it into making internal reforms.

The theoretical implications of that position—based on the Jackson-Vanik amendment—would certainly merit further study since it questions the very foundation of the nation state—the principle of national sovereignty.

Thank you for your attention.

Senator CLARK. Thank you very much.

Senator JAVITS has come in. Do you have any questions?

Senator JAVITS. I came like Senator McGee, notwithstanding other distractions, because of my respect for the Foreign Policy Association and my own participation in the Great Decisions movement. I hope I will be excused if I leave for about 10 minutes to go to another hearing and return, as I shall be seeing these participants later in the day.

I have no questions at this time.

VLADIVOSTOK AGREEMENT

Senator CLARK. We thank you very much for your presentation. One question that I had was whether or not in the Great Decisions program you might have discussed the Vladivostok agreement.

Mr. RICE. That occurred after the book was prepared and the questions the participants were given did not include any reference to that agreement, so I cannot express any opinion as to what the participants think.

ALTERNATIVE POLICIES TOWARD DÉTENTE

Mr. RUPRECHT. If I may make one more statement. I think the group also felt that there was very little choice in terms of alternative policies toward détente.

Senator CLARK. In other words, they strongly support the idea of détente because there seems to be little alternative, given the nuclear age?

Mr. RUPRECHT. Yes, sir, the vast majority would certainly indicate that.

PREVAILING FEELING U.S. HAS NOT BEEN TOUGH ENOUGH

Senator CLARK. I gather from your comments, and I want to be sure that I am not overstating it, that there may have been a prevailing feeling among your discussants that perhaps the United States had not been tough enough in our relationship with the Soviet Union and its present policy. Is that too strong a statement?

Mr. RUPRECHT. I think you are right to read that into your statements. There are, of course, as most of us have realized, certain limitations on détente, and these limitations are implicit on both sides. The Soviet Union feels that we must do nothing within détente to erode the ideological base of socialism or to otherwise interfere in its internal affairs, whereas the United States' position is that it would oppose any attempt by any nation to achieve a position of predominance globally or regionally and that we would resist any attempt to exploit a policy of détente to weaken our alliances.

Senator CLARK. Thank you very much.

TRADE CONDITIONS AS "INTERFERENCE IN INTERNAL AFFAIRS" QUESTIONED

Senator JAVITS. Before you let the witness go, I just ran through his statement. One thing I would like to ask him about is relative to the so-called Jackson-Vanik amendment to which, as you know, I was very much a party.

If the United States should believe that in order to justify extensive trade, we require two conditions in a trading partner. One is that the likelihood of honoring trade commitments will be good and therefore, that the trading partner does not harbor improper designs on us or on the world. Second, that the likelihood of contributing with what we supply to world peace is greater if there is a more open rather than closed society. In view of the fact most of those who participated in the decisions said they do not see the need for granting too many concessions, would it not be proper, therefore, to say that where there is an example of a practice within that country that tends to keep it a more closed country, one less likely to meet its commitments, one less likely to be open to world view as to its basic intentions, that we choose not to trade with them, rather than to say that we are interfering in their internal affairs?

For example, the Russians have told me, and they have told dozens of others in my position, that they do not really have to trade with us, there is plenty of stuff they can buy from England, France, Germany, Japan, but that they would like to because it would make closer relations with us. So, we are not starving them out; it is not a case of the Arab oil embargo.

How are we forcing them by saying as a condition for dealing we want to see a more open society in the Soviet Union?

Mr. RUPRECHT. The question here becomes a very complicated one because I believe that international law, and even the United Nations Organization as it is presently organized, is centered around the system of the sovereignty of the nation state—which means to me and probably to the academic community, that each nation state is finally responsible for its own international affairs and that it cannot on principle, accept the interference of any other nation.

Senator JAVITS. The key word is interference. And all I am asking you is are we interfering if we say we will not sell you goods for money because we do not like the climate in your country, especially in a decision where there is nothing preemptive about it? They can buy it anywhere. They like to do business with us. We like to do business with them, but we do not prefer to do business with people who keep that kind of closed society and tight rein on their people. Where is the interference? They denounced the trade agreement. They did not consider that interference with American economy. They threw it right out the window.

Mr. RUPRECHT. I think I would represent the Great Decisions program and participants correctly if I would say that the majority had felt that the terms that we were trying to impose on the Soviet Union would be completely unacceptable to the people of this country. I am speaking specifically of those who have participated in this program. They would interpret such a policy as interference. This is the consensus of the term as I understand it, when I look at the comments that we have received based on the question of whether we should use trade concessions to liberalize the Soviet system.

INTERFERENCE IN ANOTHER COUNTRY'S INTERNAL AFFAIRS

Senator JAVITS. I hope that as you explore this matter further in the work of the Foreign Policy Association the question might be turned around. Do we consider it interference in the internal affairs of

the United States to embargo oil? Do we consider it interference in the affairs of the United States to boycott certain American companies? We do not seem to be sending the Army and Navy and Air Force out to take care of that. That is their choice. We will do our best to live with it. Are we not in this case, as you say, venturing into an area where the whole concept of the nation state has to be challenged. Suppose the Arabs really did grind the world to a halt and let it freeze to death. We had better think about what we are going to do about that. That is not only true of oil. It is true of lots of other commodities of which we have an even shorter supply in this country than oil. So, I suggest to you that we had better do a lot of thinking about it—there is a lot of educating to be done.

Mr. RUPRECHT. Senator Javits, will you permit me to make a personal comment?

Senator JAVITS. Please.

Mr. RUPRECHT. You are quite right, I think that we should be taking a hard look at the principle of sovereignty but, there might be other approaches which may not be considered to be an interference in another nation's internal structure. The approach I am thinking of specifically is in our rhetoric called the functional approach, and the functional approach, of course, has been applied quite successfully amongst the nations of the Common Market. Because of basic economic agreements there nations have experienced a certain spill-over phenomenon into other areas, especially into the social and political spheres. I would like to read the comment by one of our participants for the record: "The United States should strive to establish stronger trade ties with the USSR so as to make them and ourselves interdependent. But this kind of interdependency does not mean that we stipulate the condition that they necessarily liberalize their internal structure, because that kind of condition, applied by the Soviets to this country, would be considered unacceptable by our people."

Senator JAVITS. Thank you very much.

Mr. RICE. If I may have the opportunity to make a comment I would like to remind you and Senator Clark that this does not represent the opinion necessarily of the Foreign Policy Association. We were merely reporting here the reactions that we have gotten from the participants across the country, and as Professor Ruprecht pointed out, there was a substantial indication in the comments and votes of the participants that they did interpret the Jackson amendment as interference.

"CASH-AND-CARRY" ATTITUDE

I would like also to say for the record, while I am speaking, that a glib naive comment about the "cash-and-carry" attitude does not represent the views of any substantial number of participants. In fact, it was only one person's suggestion. So I do not think you should think that we are reporting to you that there is a substantial sentiment in the country to that effect, although Professor Ruprecht pointed out, there was substantial indication among the voters of the participants that we should proceed with caution and not give too much without getting something in return.

Senator JAVITS. Thank you. I think your point is very well taken.

Senator CLARK. Next we are going to hear about controlling nuclear weapons from Carol Baumann of the Institute of World Affairs, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Wis.

You have an interesting topic so go right ahead.

STATEMENT OF CAROL EDLER BAUMANN, INSTITUTE OF WORLD AFFAIRS, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mrs. BAUMANN. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I will discuss the attitudes, views, and opinions of Great Decisions participants on the topic, "Controlling Nuclear Weapons: What Problems? What Prospects?" These particular views have been drawn from citizen participation in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Missouri, Ohio, Wisconsin, Nevada, and Oregon, but we believe they are representative of the thousands of Great Decisions participants throughout the entire country. They were expressed in opinion ballots, discussion groups, and verbal comments.

Although the topic of "Controlling Nuclear Weapons" was regarded by many as the most complex of all the issues included in the 1975 program, it was also recognized as one of the most vital. Both for purposes of discussion and for registering opinions, the topic was divided into two subtopics:

(1) The strategic nuclear arms race between the Soviet Union and the United States and the policies which the United States should pursue in that competition, and

(2) The problem of worldwide nuclear proliferation.

U. S.-SOVIET NUCLEAR ARMS RACE

A majority—ranging from 50 percent to 75 percent—favored the continuation of current U.S. policies to seek treaty agreements to limit offensive nuclear weapons systems on the basis of general equality and to strive for balanced reductions in the future. However, there was also a consistent and sizable minority—ranging from 10 percent to 50 percent—that favored faster and more extensive progress toward nuclear arms control; for example, by proposing "immediate" mutual reductions in present strategic nuclear forces and a "total ban" on the deployment of new weapons.

There were other indications that the public, at least as represented by Great Decisions participants, would be willing to advance further toward strategic arms control than current policies envisage. Sizable minorities favored the search for a gradual and mutual phasing out of land-based missiles, a unilateral postponement in the development of new U.S. nuclear weapons, and a slowdown in the deployment of those weapons. Taken together, these expressions indicate a continuing concern about the dangers of any nuclear arms race escalation and a desire not only to avoid such escalation, but to curb the race and reduce the total numbers of nuclear weapons on both sides. Some favored the increased utilization of the United Nations to achieve these goals.

WORLDWIDE NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION

With regard to worldwide nuclear proliferation, a strong minority of participants again supported current U.S. policies aimed at containing the spread of nuclear weapons through the nonproliferation treaty.

while also promoting international cooperation on the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. An even heavier minority, in fact a plurality, favored the development of energy technology not based on nuclear fission.

Senator CLARK. Would you repeat that?

Mrs. BAUMANN. An even heavier minority, in fact a plurality favor the development of energy technology not based on nuclear fission.

Senator CLARK. Not based on nuclear?

Mrs. BAUMANN. Not based on nuclear. Many expressed firm opposition to the U.S. sale of nuclear reactors, fuel and technology to countries which have not ratified the nonproliferation treaty; others opposed such sales to any foreign countries.

SALT TALKS AND VLADIVOSTOK ACCORDS

In conclusion, concerning the SALT—strategic arms limitations talks—talks themselves, a consensus emerged that the Vladivostok accords, though a step in the right direction, established the ceiling on total strategic delivery vehicles at too high a level. Once those accords have been confirmed in a formal treaty, participants urged that negotiations should immediately be undertaken to move toward further reductions of the ceiling level. The sense of urgency which prevailed in many of the discussion groups reflects a widespread belief that the administration should continue and intensify its efforts in the area of nuclear arms control, and, if necessary, that it should be prodded in that direction by Congress. Thank you.

Senator CLARK. It is a good, consistent report and I guess I think it is good because I agree with it. [Laughter.]

NUCLEAR CAPABILITY ASSISTANCE IN MIDDLE EAST

Senator CLARK. I was interested in your comments about introducing nuclear capability in other parts of the world.

Did you discuss at all or, to your knowledge, did your groups discuss the policies of our Government toward nuclear capability assistance in the Middle East, particularly with Egypt?

Mrs. BAUMANN. This was one of the areas in which there is obvious concern. Much of the original concern over this, of course, was the Indian explosion of their nuclear device. This began the discussion.

I would just add a comment here. In discussions yesterday at the State Department it was pointed out that the United States in its sales of nuclear reactors and other devices attaches more stringent safeguards to their later utilization than are imposed by other countries. I do not know whether this was brought up directly in the discussions, but I think this might have changed the voting. But that is a guess.

Senator CLARK. Thank you very much, I appreciate having you here.

Our changing world economy, and oil states of the Persian Gulf, are our next topics. We will hear from Pitman Buck, Jr., Great Decisions program, Galveston County, Tex., and Howard Stephens, Division of Continuing Education, University of Arkansas, Little Rock. Proceed in any way you feel appropriate.

STATEMENT OF PITMAN S. BUCK, JR., GREAT DECISIONS PROGRAM, GALVESTON COUNTY, TEXAS CITY, TEX.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I am Pitman Buck, Jr. I reside in Texas City, Tex. The subject before us this morning concerns our changing world economy. Because of the obvious price relationship of Persian Gulf oil to the world economy it was decided to combine the two topics and treat them together.

RECENT GLOBAL ECONOMIC CHANGES

The past 18 months have seen the most abrupt changes in global economics of this generation. While a few national economies were lifted to unprecedented highs, others first experienced extravagant rates of inflation and then were very quickly thrown into deep recessions. America herself was experiencing double-digit inflation during a time of rapidly rising unemployment. So confused were many economists that some said "the new economics" had been tried and found wanting. Some surely would have shot John Maynard Keynes had he not already been dead. Speculators, reaping huge profits on commodity markets, were overheard to whisper "Long live Adam Smith." The equity and bond markets of the industrialized countries were all going in the same direction and the direction was down.

QUADRUPLING OF CRUDE OIL PRICES BY OPEC

The immediate cause of this economic upheaval was, of course, the quadrupling of crude oil prices by OPEC [oil producing and exporting countries]. A common problem facing most governments of the world today is how best to deal with the various aspects of these oil price increases, not only from a national viewpoint but in full recognition of the interdependence which exists among nations for the unique raw materials and natural resources of each.

BALLOT TABULATION CONCERNING WORLD ECONOMY AND PERSIAN GULF OIL STATES

We in Great Decisions hope that by bringing to you the consensus results of our nationwide studies on these two widely discussed topics, we will in some way aid you, our elected representatives, in making your own great decisions.

On the world economy topic, tabulations of the ballots indicate that a majority of the respondents favor (a) which calls for the continuation of certain specified policies such as promotion of freer trade, further reduction of trade barriers in GATT [General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade] negotiations now underway, international community efforts to recycle petrodollars, and the others mentioned in item (a). The next percentage choices (approximately 30 percent each) show that the American people urge conservation of resources through the slowing down of economic growth (f), the encouragement of multinational companies (d), and increased economic aid to developing countries (g).

Ballot tabulations on the Persian Gulf oil states topic show *a* and *g* highest on the list of policy priorities; *a* calls for the maintenance of cordial relations with the Gulf states, and evenhandedness in the Arab-Israeli conflict, while *g* shows that many Americans apparently are willing to accept mandatory oil conservation measures such as rationing or a gasoline tax.

If there are any questions concerning these matters I will try to answer them.

Thank you.

Senator CLARK. OK, fine. I think first we will go right on to Mr. Stephens.

**STATEMENT OF HOWARD G. STEPHENS, UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS
AT LITTLE ROCK, DIVISION OF CONTINUING EDUCATION, GREAT
DECISIONS PROGRAM**

Mr. STEPHENS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I am Howard Stephens, director of Continuing Education Division, University of Arkansas, and State coordinator for the Great Decisions program in Arkansas. At the outset, I would like to state that I do not envy you gentlemen the task that you face in your attempts to find workable solutions for our economic woes because there are apparently no clear-cut answers. It is indeed a tremendous task.

EFFORTS TO HALT INFLATION ON RIGHT TRACK

The general feeling of the Great Decisions group is that the United States is on the right track in its attempts to halt the rapidly rising tide of inflation by attempting to equalize our balance of payments. The 80 or so delegates attending our annual conference voice concern that the United States, as a major world power, should maintain initiative in stabilizing the world economy. There is major support for continuing current policies—based upon freer trade, lower trade barriers, cordial relations with OPEC, an evenhanded policy on the Arab-Israel issue, and cooperation to lower the price of oil.

U.S. ENERGY INDEPENDENCE URGED

Throughout our deliberations, and indeed, in my contacts with people in the State of Arkansas, there is strong feeling that we should strive for independence in one of our most vulnerable spots—energy. As you all know we are rapidly becoming interdependent in energy. We must strive for independence. Our depending on other countries for a goodly portion of our energy must be alleviated. We are mandated to utilize our vast reservoirs of technological skills in developing alternate sources of energy. We are aware that the world's reserves of fossil fuels are rapidly diminishing, and we must initiate mandatory oil conservation measures at home. The feeling of our countrywide study groups is that strong measures must be taken, either in the form of rationing or higher taxes.

U.S. ECONOMIC PRESSURES TO LOWER OIL PRICES SUGGESTED

A major factor in the declining world economy is the dependence of the world on OPEC. Many conference participants relate that the study groups in the various States feel that the United States should

exert economic pressures to bring down the high price of oil. Many mention the possibility of blackmail in reverse. In 1973 the United States exported 44 percent of the total world's wheat and 50 percent of the livestock feed grains. Food can be power—we do not wish for food to be used to exert economic pressures, but in the event this becomes necessary, we must take full advantage of it.

REDISTRIBUTION OF PETRODOLLARS INTO ECONOMY

What are we to do in relation to the redistribution of petrodollars back into the economy? Should we draw the line when other countries or multinational organizations want to invest in our country? We cannot on one hand invest U.S. dollars all over the world, and then say “no” to countries that wish to invest in our country. We must keep them out of our vital defense industries, and as some of my friends have stated in serious jest, and I concur, we can always expropriate them.

SUMMARY

In summary we should strive toward the following:

Continue current policies promoting freer trade and lower trade barriers.

Keep cordial relations with OPEC countries and maintain even-handed policy on the Arab-Israel issue.

Most importantly, begin strong programs to conserve our energy resources and begin an all-out national effort to develop alternate sources of energy in order to achieve total energy independence at the earliest possible date.

Mr. STEPHENS. Thank you, sir.

Senator CLARK. Thank you very much.

FOOD AS ECONOMIC WEAPON

How do you think we could use food as an economic weapon against OPEC or the Arab nations?

Mr. STEPHENS. By raising the price of wheat. But the Great Decisions people on the whole do not wish this type of thing to happen.

Senator CLARK. The countries that probably could best afford such a policy would be the oil countries, and the developing nations would be the principle victims of it.

REASON FOR REVERSING TREND TOWARD FOREIGN OIL DEPENDENCY

I was interested in the position, as I understand you to state it, that your discussants really favored doing something pretty quickly and pretty strongly about reversing the trend toward dependency on foreign oil, and you mentioned rationing or higher prices as doing that.

Would you say that the principle reason why they think we have to move in that direction is due to foreign policy considerations—fear of blackmail from Middle Eastern countries—or is it an economic question as you interpret it?

One of the interesting things that has happened with regard to Middle Eastern oil is that economists now agree that the industrialized nations have adjusted more rapidly than we ever dreamed to the

increased prices. Japan, for example, 99 percent dependent upon foreign oil, has raised the prices of her other commodities to the point where Japan has a favorable balance of trade, and paying for oil and paying for increased prices of grain. So are many of the other nations of the world. The United States has not adjusted quite so quickly. We had only a \$10 billion trade deficit and many people argue we will be able to adjust to that in another year. But that does not really deal with the developing nations, which really have not been able to adjust to the increased prices. And, of course, it does not deal with the question of our foreign policy objectives, whether or not we can afford to remain so dependent upon Middle Eastern oil. I think the figures are that about 10 percent of America's supply of crude oil comes from the Arab nations that participated in the embargo.

Mr. STEPHENS. Less than 7 percent.

Senator CLARK. I appreciate that figure.

BARTERING AS APPROACH TO TRADE IMBALANCE

Mr. STEPHENS. I would like to address myself just briefly to the imbalance of trade that you mentioned.

There has been some comment on our balance as one way to approach the imbalance of trade is to trade through barter; trade a bushel of wheat for a barrel of oil. There should be exact parity between a bushel of wheat and a barrel of oil. At least we would be limiting the outflow of our dollars. They need the wheat and we need the oil, let us trade.

Senator CLARK. That is worth considering. The problem is that these countries are in such a strong economic position that they can buy wheat from anybody. We are not. If they do not get grain from us, they can get it with great ease from other countries. The other problem is that most of these countries are not very populous—we need a lot more oil than they need wheat. Kuwait and the Arab Emirates and Saudi Arabia; for example, are not big wheat consumers compared to our use of oil. But I appreciate your comments very much—we are happy to have you here.

You want to make another comment?

Mr. BUCK. I would like to address myself to one other item which I left out in my statement.

Senator CLARK. Go right ahead.

USE OF MILITARY PRESSURE AGAINST ARAB OIL PRODUCING COUNTRIES

Mr. BUCK. It concerned use of military pressure against the Arab oil producing countries because of the oil embargo. On the opinion ballot there was relatively a negative response to such action. Our ballot tabulation showed that only 5 percent favored, and then only as a last resort, using military pressure.

Senator CLARK. I was going to ask you about that.

Mr. BUCK. I thought of that. As I say, I did not put it in my remarks, but it occurred to me because of the comments of Senator Javits.

Senator CLARK. I want to be sure I understand this. You are referring to the Secretary of State's comments earlier in the year that as a last resort, in the face of economic strangulation we might be prepared to use military force to secure Middle East oil. You said

about 5 percent of your membership thought that, under those circumstances, we should perhaps pursue that policy?

Mr. BUCK. Right. In precise wording, only 5 percent checked the item which calls for the exertion of military pressure as a last resort to bring down the price of oil.

Senator CLARK. Thank you very much.

Mr. BUCK. Thank you sir.

Senator CLARK. The last item on our agenda is the oceans and the seabed. Edna Anderson of World Affairs Council of Syracuse, N.Y. Glad to have you here, go right ahead.

STATEMENT OF EDNA BARRIE ANDERSON, WORLD AFFAIRS COUNCIL OF SYRACUSE, SYRACUSE, N.Y.

Ms. ANDERSON. Thank you, Senator Clark, and for the record, committee members, I am the president of the World Affairs Council in Syracuse, N.Y., and I am testifying as an afterthought because we had not intended originally to present the opinion census on the oceans and the seabed, but, we found great interest in the subject exhibited in the discussion groups. We decided to include it, and I am the one who has been asked to represent that point of view.

The group here today represents thousands—a rough estimate sets the number at 150,000—of concerned citizens from all parts of the Nation—from urban, suburban, and rural areas—who have participated for the past 8 weeks in informal discussion groups as part of a study program sponsored by organizations who are interested in the development of foreign policy on a sound and rational basis. We call it "Great Decisions".

Much of the material we study is furnished by the Foreign Policy Association, who has sponsored this conference to evaluate these local efforts to stimulate informed discussion and decision on major foreign policy issues.

The conduct of foreign policy obviously becomes more complex and difficult as the world becomes increasingly interdependent.

With the Third United Nations Law of the Sea Conference laboring in Geneva to achieve some agreement which will head off conflicts over fishing rights, right of commercial and military vessels to passage through straits, exploitation of mineral resources, pollution control and scientific exploration and research, we have asked to present the views of the participants in the Great Decisions program on treatment of the oceans and seabed because we have had strong reactions to the discussion sessions. No topic in the series evoked more interest than this one, titled "The Oceans and the Seabed."

The fact that the Law of the Sea Conference faces the resolution of which will be a part of future U.S. policy decisions has moved us to bring you those opinions from a nationwide consensus of concerned and informed citizens. We must stress that it is a rough consensus, but we feel it indicates a trend in the thinking of a group of informed and interested citizens. Those people play a larger part in the acceptance or rejection of policy decisions of our government particularly for that reason—they are active in their communities; they are interested in foreign policy; and thanks to Great Decisions they are better informed than the average citizen.

It seems to us that we have here a great opportunity for countries to reach agreement to place a small limit on their sovereign powers in order to gain greatly in solving common problems of fishing, environment pollution, seabed mining, and those other pressing problems which pertain to the last great undeveloped kingdom on Earth.

RESULTS OF OCEANS AND SEABEDS BALLOTING

Let me quickly give you the results of our balloting on this issue:

A landslide vote supported continuation of current U.S. policy which seeks an internationally agreed and negotiated law of the sea that provides for 12-mile territorial sea; a 200-mile off-shore economic zone; free transit through the more than 100 international straits; right of coastal States or private enterprise—under international licensing—to develop and mine deep seabed minerals.

The second consensus, with a lesser number favoring, but still a strong trend, felt full control over exploitation of the deep ocean seabed should be vested in an international authority, and of those voting, most felt this should be the United Nations.

A lesser trend indicated that regulation of fisheries within the 200-mile economic zone should be the prerogative of the coastal State having jurisdiction and that the coastal State should have the right to develop resources within this area.

A very few people—an average of around 4 percent of those voting—favored a narrower territorial sea—3 or 6 miles—to safeguard mobility and maneuverability of U.S. defense forces.

Around 10 percent voted to acknowledge the right of nations bordering international straits to control the passage of ships and planes through their territorial waters and air.

The question pertaining to the support of legislation authorizing the U.S. Government to assert deep ocean mining rights for U.S. corporations received affirmative votes from approximately 15 percent of those who voted.

The vote for those opting for withdrawal from the International Law of the Sea Conference, and for unilateral action, was negligible.

We believe that the nations of the world must make every reasonable effort to resolve their differences on these critical ocean problems.

We believe that our citizens want to be a part of those solutions. Thank you very much.

QUESTION OF EDUCATION

Senator CLARK. That is an excellent report.

I guess the basic problem is the same one one always has when discussing giving up a part of our own sovereignty and territorial rights, and that is basically a question of education. That is what your organization is all about.

Ms. ANDERSON. Yes.

Senator CLARK. We are delighted that you made this report and delighted to have the information. Thank you.

I think that completes the presentations.

MAJOR REEVALUATION OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY SUGGESTED

I was thinking as I sat here that, as one member of the committee, and a very junior member, that maybe this next year would be a good year for your organization to start looking at the total direction of American foreign policy. It seems to me that we are going through a period that will be seen as a watershed, a turning point. The events now taking place in Southeast Asia should stimulate a thorough reappraisal of what most of us would agree has been a 10-year failure. We must examine the effect that that has had on the American people and their attitude toward other parts of the world.

We must evaluate the changing nature of NATO, the uncertainty in Portugal, the alienation of Greece, and our policy toward Turkey. And we must take a hard look at the apparent failure of our recent efforts to achieve peace in the Middle East. All of these developments make it possible now—30 years after the beginning of the Cold War—for the Administration and the Congress, and the people of this country, to undertake a major reevaluation of our foreign policy, to engage in a meaningful, broad-ranging public debate on the issues before us. No group is better prepared to participate in such a debate than your group. We must take a hard look at where we have been, at how successful we have been with the methods we have been using, and at where we want to go? And in that debate we should discuss whether the basic assumptions of our foreign policy, perhaps of every country's foreign policy in the last several decades, have been correct.

Have we been all that successful in controlling the arms race or in using our immense power? Should our role as a nation continue to be more of the same or is this, perhaps, the time to see whether there may be some other ways in which we can play a leadership role in the world, in more profitable, economic, constructive ways. The alternative may be isolationism, and to those of us who have lived for very long, that is not the right direction to go. We do have some national interests and above all, some international interests in the world—we do have a role to play in the world. But we shall continue to fail if we continue to view that role simply in terms of through the use of more and more arms sales and grants, more force and threats of force.

As you meet here in Washington this week, you might consider pursuing this larger question as well as continuing your individual discussion subjects. I think there is a great need for this kind of reevaluation and unless I misread the times, there is a great opportunity for it. I think Americans believe that we should look back and see where we have been and what we have learned, so we can chart a more rational course toward where we want to go.

Mr. BURGESS. I am the junior chairman of FPA, just having come aboard recently, so I think your comments are most appropriate. Our association does follow a nonposition-taking-effort in this country. We try to place objective and balanced materials before the people who appeared before you this morning. I think we have several opportunities and in our Great Decisions programs to have your points brought before our participants and all, and also through our headlines series. We will work on your helpful comments.

COMMENDATION OF WITNESSES

Senator CLARK. We thank you very much for coming again this year and we look forward to hearing the results of next year's balloting. You have done an excellent job and we appreciate your being here.

Mr. BURGESS. If I may thank Mr. Holt for what he did for us and also your colleagues for being here. I just want to tell you this group worked as hard over these last 3 days and nights on this testimony and with their statements and as thoroughly as any of the appointed officials of Government do when they come before you.

Senator CLARK. We are most appreciative of your efforts. The hearing is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:40 a.m., the committee adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.]





107

GENERAL BOOKBINDING CO.

77 20NY3 13 071 I P

QUALITY CONTROL MARK

6605

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 05706 0822

